

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending with the entry of this amendment. The Claims have been amended in view of the examiner's interview of October 30, 2003. In the examiners interview of October 30, 2003, several features of the Applicant's disclosure were acknowledged by the examiner as not shown in Degura, however, they presented new issues and thus would not be considered. The claims have been amended in view of the examiner's interview to include these features.

Claims 1-18 have been previously rejected by Degura, however, the rejections are rendered moot in view of the amendments as shown below.

Novelty

Claims 1-7, 17 and 18 were rejected as being anticipated by Degura. The Office Action relied on Figures 12 and 13 for this assessment.

Figures 12 and 13 are descriptive of Degura's third embodiment. The third embodiment of Degura is directed to multiplexing multiple channels over a optical trunk line and de-multiplexing the channels at the receiver side of the trunk line by chirp signal slope.

Degura discloses "input signals of a plurality of channels are multiplexed and transmitted by using a common transmission path and the signal is separated on the reception side, on the transmission side the input signals are chirp converted by the different chirp converting characteristics of every channel, and, thereafter, the converted

signals are added and output to the common transmission path, and on the other hand, on the reception side, each signal is separated by the chirp conversion based on the chirp converting characteristics opposite to the chirp converting characteristics of the channels on the transmission side”. Col. 16, lines 3-14.

The disclosed third embodiment of Degura is not a multiple access system as ordinarily described in the art and as claimed in each of the current claims as amended.

Furthermore Claims 1-7 recite a limitation of a mobile station. All of the channels disclosed in Degura use a common transmission path as described above and therefore preclude the use of mobile stations, since all the transmitters are tied to the common transmission path.

In addition, Claims 1-19 as amended include the feature of encoding data in the chirp signals as the starting frequency of subsequent chirps. Degura does not disclose this feature.

Therefore, for these reasons and others, Degura cannot anticipate Claims 1-7, 17, 18 or new Claims 19 and 20.

Obviousness

The Office Action rejected Claims 8-16 as being obvious over Degura. Claims 8-16 include the features of a multiple access system and specific data encoding. As discussed above, Degura does not disclose such features and thus can not solely constitute an obvious type rejection.

CONCLUSION

The Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-18, and allowance of Claims 19 and 20, as Degura does not show, teach or suggest the features recited in the claims as discussed above.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois	Reg. No. 46,285
L. Lawton Rogers, III	Reg. No. 24,302
D. Joseph English	Reg. No. 42,514
Patrick D. McPherson	Reg. No. 46,255

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801

Dated: December 2, 2003